UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/741,512	12/19/2003	Anil Kumar Chebolu	030708	6302

38516 7590 06/19/2009

AT&T Legal Department - SZ
Attn: Patent Docketing
Room 2A-207
One AT&T Way
Bedminster, NJ 07921

EXAMINER	
LE, CANH	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2439	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
06/19/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/741,512	CHEBOLU ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	CANH LE	2439	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *13 April 2009*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-8,11-29,31-50 and 52-63* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-8,11-29,31-50 and 52-63* is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) *6,7,21,22 and 48* is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

This Office Action is in response to the communication filed on 04/13/2009.

Claims 9-10, 30, and 51 have been cancelled.

Claims 1-5, 7-8, 11-13, 15-26, 28-29, 31-34, 36-47, 49-50, 52-55, and 57-63 have been amended.

Claims 1-8, 11-21, 22-29, 31-42, 43-50, and 52-63 have been examined and are pending.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 04/13/2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The Applicant argues the following:

(a) The combination of Beilinson, Kruglenko, and Lapidous do not teach "intercept a message for opening a window associated with a requested computer application, the message intercepted before receipt thereof by an operating system to prevent opening the window."

(b) The combination of Beilison, Kruglenko, and Lapidous do not teach "when the requested computer application is matched to the list of restricted computer applications, then prohibit opening the window associated with the requested computer application to terminate the requested computer application".

(c) The combination teaching of Lapidous with Beilinson and Kruglendo still only uses a hook procedure to intercept message, not “a message for opening a window”.

(d) Because Lapidous has already opened the window, the proposed combination of Lapidous with Beilinson and Kruglendo can not "intercept a message for opening a window associated with a requested computer application, the message intercepted before receipt thereof an operating system to prevent opening the window".

The Examiner respectfully disagrees with the Applicant for the following reasons:

Per (a):

Kruglenko teaches mechanism to intercept message using hook technology in window environment before the message reach to a target window *[Kruglenko: par. [0056]; "A hook is a point in the message-handling mechanism where the message traffic is monitor in order to intercept and process certain message before they reach their target window procedure 306. When a message that is associated with a hook is intercepted, the system passes the message to the hook procedure referenced in the hook chain].*

In addition, Lapidous teaches a control unit to intercept the message for opening the window before receipt thereof by an operating system to prevent opening the window *[Lapidous: par. [0011]; a Pop-Up Stopper ® Pro and other similar applications allow users to specify a list of sites allowed to open popup windows , and reject popup windows initiated by a site that is not included in the list; fig. 2; intercept request to open window (label 202); par. [0047]].*

Therefore, the combination of Beilinson, Kruglenko, and Lapidous positively teach the aforementioned limitation above.

Per (b):

Beilinson and Lapidous teach when the requested computer application is matched to the list of restricted computer applications, then prohibit opening the window associated with the requested computer application to terminate the requested computer application *[*Beilinson: *par. [0007]; par. [0054-0055]; "Function name sub-category 234 is used to deny or enable a user access to computer functions"*; *Lapidous: par. [0011]; a Pop-Up Stopper ® Pro and other similar applications allow users to specify a list of sites allowed to open popup windows , and reject (i.e. prohibiting opening the window) popup windows initiated by a site that is not included in the list; fig. 2; intercept request to open window (label 202); par. [0047]];*

Therefore, the combination of Beilinson, Kruglenko, and Lapidous positively teach the aforementioned limitation above.

Per (c):

The Kruglenko teaches mechanism to intercept message using hook technology in window environment before the message reach to a target window *[Kruglenko: par. [0056]; "A hook is a point in the message-handling mechanism where the message traffic is monitor in order to intercept and process certain message before they reach their target window procedure 306. When a message that is associated with a hook is intercepted, the system passes the message to the hook procedure referenced in the hook chain].*

Lapidous discloses rejecting popup windows initiated by a site (i.e. intercepting a message for popup windows) that not included in the list *[Lapidous: par. [0011]; fig. 2; intercept request to open window (label 202); par. [0047]].*

Therefore, the combination of Beilinson, Kruglenko, and Lapidous positively teach the aforementioned limitation above.

Per (d):

The combination of Lapidous with Beilinson and Kruglendo teach intercept a message for opening a window associated with a requested computer application, the message intercepted before receipt thereof an operating system to prevent opening the window [*Kruglenko: par. [0056]; Beilinson: par. [0007]; par. [0054-0055]; Function name sub-category 234 is used to deny or enable a user access to computer functions; Lapidous: par. [0011]; fig. 2; intercept request to open window (label 202); par. [0047]; If the network address is not on the "white list", the secondary window is closed or prevented from opening; In order to block a popup window, a system must monitor or detect a message].*

Therefore, the combination of Beilinson, Kruglenko, and Lapidous positively teach the aforementioned limitation above.

Response to Amendment

Applicant's amendment of the specifications on 04/13/2009 is acknowledged.

The objection of the claims 1, 22, and 43 has been withdrawn due to amendment filed on 04/13/2009.

The 35 U.S.C. 101 rejection of claims 1-8, 11-21, 22-29, and 31-42 has been withdrawn due to amendment filed on 04/13/2009.

The 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd rejection of claims 1, 22, and 43 has been withdrawn due to amendment filed on 04/13/2009.

Claim Objections

Claims 6-7, 21-22, and 48 are objected to because of the following informalities:

(Claim 6, line 1): “the form" should be replaced by "a form" to avoid potentially antecedent basis.

(Claim 7, line 3): “the respective" should be replaced by "the user" to avoid potentially antecedent basis.

(Claim 21, line 3): “the respective user" should be replaced by "the user" to avoid potentially antecedent basis.

(Claim 22, line 1): “the form" should be replaced by "a form" to avoid potentially antecedent basis.

(Claim 48, line 1): “the form" should be replaced by "a form" to avoid potentially antecedent basis.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-5, 15-19, 22-26, 36-40, 43-47, and 57-61 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Beilinson et al.** (US2004/0003279 A1) in view of **Kruglenko** (US 2003/0217287 A1) further in view of **Lapidous** (US 2004/0125149 A1).

As per claim 1:

Beilinson teaches a system for controlling computer access, comprising:

a processor executing code stored in memory that causes the processor to **[Beilinson: fig. 1] :**

(a) control access to use of a omputer according to settings specified by an administrator for at least one user of the computer **[Beilinson: abstract; par. [0004]; lines 9-13; par. [0048]-[0060]; par. [0051], lines 5-8; A parent can use sub-category 288 to set specific times during the day that a child is allowed to use the computer. Also, a administrator can limit an employee's allowable login hours to the hours that the employee regularly works]**, wherein the administrator can input changes to the settings locally to the computer and remotely from the computer on another computer to which the settings do not apply **[Beilinson: par. [0070]; "fig. 5 is an embodiment of the system 500 of the present invention. Group policy objects 510 which circulate around a local network 512 hold the user authorization settings that have been configured through the system controls 514 typically through an administrator's computer 516. The local network 512 needed to support the invention could be a traditional LAN or WAN. However, it could also be any communications link between two or more computers. So, to be part of the local network 512, a computer needs**

to be able to communicate with at least one other computer in the local network 512 and needs to be identified as part of the local network 512 …"];

(b) store a list of restricted computer applications **[Beilinson: par. [0007]; computer functions include executing software application such as word processors or games; par. [0008]; fig. 2 par. [0041]; par. [0048-0049]; par. [0054]; a restriction component 214 can be used to restrict specific computer functions 226 (e.g. restricted computer application)]**;

(d) compare the requested computer application to the list of restricted computer applications **[Beilinson: par. [0007]; par. [0054-0055]; "Function name sub-category 234 is used to deny or enable a user access to computer functions"]**;

(e) when the requested computer application is matched to the list of restricted computer applications, then prohibit opening the window associated with the requested computer application terminate the requested computer application **[Beilinson: par. [0007]; par. [0054-0055]; "Function name sub-category 234 is used to deny or enable a user access to computer functions"]**; and

(f) collect information from the computer on which local computer applications the respective user is attempting to access on the computer, the information being compiled in a report regarding the user, the report being made accessible to the administrator from a remote database **[Beilinson: "Desired data is collected which can be distilled into reports on total system usage, computer function usage, function process time, unsuccessful computer function usage attempts and the like. The administrator may apply various filters to the raw data in order to generate reports containing only desired information…. The administrator is further provided with the ability to monitor a user's activity via a read-**

only view of a user's computer display"; par. [0044]; "The monitoring and auditing component 212 is used to view a user machine by the administrator, to collect user activity data and to generate reports"; par. [0047]; par. [0070]].

Beilinson does not explicitly teach,

(c) intercept a message for opening a window associated with a requested computer application, the message intercepted before receipt thereof by an operating system to prevent opening the window;

However, Kruglendo teaches intercepting a message for opening a window associated with a requested computer application, the message intercepted before receipt thereof by an operating system **[Kruglenko: par. [0056]; "A hook is a point in the message-handling mechanism where the message traffic is monitor in order to intercept and process certain message before they reach their target window procedure 306 ... The action taken by the hook procedure varies between types of hooks. The message may be changed, stopped altogether, or simply monitored"];**

Therefore, it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the system of Beilinson by including the teaching of Kruglenko to provide users with a means for preventing an unsophisticated user, such as a small child, from access programs or resources on a computer that may allow the user to cause harm to a computer system by limiting access to the computer's resources to a number of predefined secure programs and resources **[Kruglenko: abstract, par. [0001]].**

Beilinson and Kruglendo disclose the claimed invention except preventing opening for a window.

However, Lapidous teach a method and apparatus for managing display of popup windows wherein preventing to open a window **[Lapidous: par. [0011]; a Pop-Up Stopper ® Pro and other similar applications allow users to specify a list of sites allowed to open popup windows , and reject (i.e. prohibiting opening the window) popup windows initiated by *a site that is not included in the list*; fig. 2; intercept request to open window (label 202); par. [0047]].**

Therefore, it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the system of Beilinson and Kruglendo by including the teaching of Lapidous wherein preventing to open a window to provide users with a means for managing display of supplemental on-screen windows known as popup windows **[Lapidous: par. [0013]].**

As per claim 2:

Beilinson further teaches the system of claim 1, wherein the report includes a duration of time the user has accessed a particular computer application **[Beilinson: abstract; "The invention enables an administrator to restrict a user's logon hours, logon duration, access to computer functions, and access to applications based on content rating"; par. [0006]; par. [0008]; par. [0022]; par. [0045], lines 5-9; "Reports can be generated on total system usage, computer function usage, function process time, unsuccessful computer function usage attempts and the like. Other reports could be generated, and the invention is not limited to the particular reports generated"].**

As per claim 3:

Beilinson further teaches the system of claim 1, wherein the report includes identification of one or more chronological times in which the user has accessed a particular computer application **[Beilinson: abstract; "The invention enables an administrator to restrict a user's logon hours, logon duration, access to computer functions, and access to applications based on content rating"; par. [0006]; par. [0008]; par. [0022]; par. [0045], lines 5-9; "Reports can be generated on total system usage, computer function usage, function process time, unsuccessful computer function usage attempts and the like. Other reports could be generated, and the invention is not limited to the particular reports generated"].**

As per claim 4:

Beilinson further teaches the system of claim 1, wherein the report includes the computer applications the user is denied access to according to the settings specified by the administrator **[Beilinson: abstract; par. [006]; "the implementation of such a system includes restricting a user's logon hours, logon duration, access to computer functions, and access to applications. In addition, the implementation of such a system includes enabling an administrator to temporarily restrict or extend a user's normally allowed access privileges as well as monitor, audit, and obtain reports of a user's computer function usage"; par. [009]; par. [0054], lines 7-8; par. [0057], lines 3-4; par. [0065], lines 11-13; "the administrator can thus easily set time of day restrictions or content rating restrictions, for example, and can also specify which reports, if any are desired"; par. [0063], lines 14-15; " a system could be denied until the day after the child's math final"].**

As per claim 5:

Beilinson teaches the system of claim 1, wherein the report includes the computer applications to which the user is granted access **[Beilinson: abstract; par. [006]; par. [009]; par. [0045]; "Reports can be generated on total system usage, computer function usage, function process time, unsuccessful computer function usage attempts and the like. Other reports could be generated, and the invention is not limited to the particular reports generated"; par. [0059], lines 5-6; a child's daily access to computer games can be limited to an amount defined by the parent; par. [0065]].**

As per claim 15:

Beilinson further teaches the system of claim 1, wherein the code further causes the processor to collect additional information on which services of a designated computer application the user is attempting to access on the computer, the additional information being compiled in a report regarding the user **[Beilinson: par. [0010], "Desired data is collected which can be distilled into reports on total system usage, computer function usage, function process time, unsuccessful computer function usage attempts and the like. The administrator may apply various filters to the raw data in order to generate reports containing only desired information…. The administrator is further provided with the ability to monitor a user's activity via a read-only view of a user's computer display"; par. [0044]; "The monitoring and auditing component 212 is used to view a user machine by the administrator, to collect user activity data and to generate reports"; par. [0047]; par.**

[0059], lines 5-6; " a child's daily access to computer games can be limited to an amount defined by the parent"; an additional information can be a child's daily access to computer games].

As per claim 16:

Beilinson further teaches the system of claim 15, wherein the report further includes a duration of time the user has accessed a particular service of the designated computer application **[Beilinson: abstract; "The invention enables an administrator to restrict a user's logon hours, logon duration, access to computer functions, and access to applications based on content rating"; par. [0006]; par. [0008]; par. [0022]; par. [0045], lines 5-9; "Reports can be generated on total system usage, computer function usage, function process time, unsuccessful computer function usage attempts and the like. Other reports could be generated, and the invention is not limited to the particular reports generated"].**

As per claim 17:

Beilinson further teaches the system of claim 15, wherein the report further includes identification of one or more chronological times in which the user has accessed the particular service of the designated computer application **[Beilinson: abstract; "The invention enables an administrator to restrict a user's logon hours, logon duration, access to computer functions, and access to applications based on content rating"; par. [0006]; par. [0008]; par. [0022]; par. [0045], lines 5-9; "Reports can be generated on total system usage, computer function usage, function process time, unsuccessful computer function usage attempts and the like.**

Other reports could be generated, and the invention is not limited to the particular reports generated"].

As per claim 18:

Beilinson further teaches the system of claim 15, wherein the report includes the services the user is denied access to according to the settings specified by the administrator **[Beilinson: abstract; par. [006]; "the implementation of such a system includes restricting a user's logon hours, logon duration, access to computer functions, and access to applications. In addition, the implementation of such a system includes enabling an administrator to temporarily restrict or extend a user's normally allowed access privileges as well as monitor, audit, and obtain reports of a user's computer function usage"; par. [0054], lines 7-8; par. [0057], lines 3-4; par. [0065], lines 11-13; "the administrator can thus easily set time of day restrictions or content rating restrictions, for example, and can also specify which reports, if any are desired"; par. [0063], lines 14-15; " a system could be denied until the day after the child's math final"].**

As per claim 19:

Beilinson further teaches the system of claim 15, wherein the report includes the services the user is granted access to according to the settings specified by the administrator **[Beilinson: abstract; par. [006]; par. [009]; par. [0045]; "Reports can be generated on total system usage, computer function usage, function process time, unsuccessful computer function usage attempts and the like. Other reports could be generated, and the invention is not**

limited to the particular reports generated"; par. [0059], lines 5-6; a child's daily access to computer games can be limited to an amount defined by the parent; par. [0065]].

As per claim 22:

This claim has limitations that are similar to those of claim 1 with additional limitation

(c) monitor messages from a requested computer application that are directed to an operating system **[Kruglenko: par. [0056]; "A hook is a point in the message-handling mechanism where the message traffic is monitor in order to intercept and process certain message before they reach their target window procedure 306 ... The action taken by the hook procedure varies between types of hooks. The message may be changed, stopped altogether, or simply monitored"],** thus it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 1 above.

As per claims 23-26 and 36-40:

Claims 23-26 and 36-40 are similar to those of claims 2-5 and 15-19 accordingly, thus it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claims 2-5 and 15-19 above.

As per claims 43-47, 57-61:

Claims 43-47 and 57-61 are essentially the same as claims 1-5 and 15-19 accordingly except that it sets forth the claimed invention as a method rather a system comprising and rejected under the same reasons as applied above.

Claims 6-8, 11, 20-21, 27-29, 31-32, 41-42, 48-50, 52-53, and 62-63 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Beilinson et al.** (US2004/0003279 A1) in view of **Kruglenko** (US 2003/0217287 A1) further in view of **Lapidous** (US 2004/0125149 A1), and further in view of **Mathew et al.** (US 2004/0003071 A1).

As per claim 6:

Beilinson, Kruglenko and Lapidous do not explicitly teach the system wherein the report is in the form of a web page.

However, Mathew teaches the system wherein the report is in the form of a web page **[Mathew: fig. 17; par. [0071]; a history summary report implemented as a Web page using a markup language].**

Thus, it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Beilinson, Kruglenko and Lapidous by including teaching of Mathew because it would allow administrator control component is operable to track and store the user's allowed and blocked online action, generate a history summary report to administrator **[Mathew, fig. 17, par. [0016]].**

As per claim 7:

Mathew further teaches the system of claim 6, wherein the report provides a mechanism for the administrator to authorize the user access to a particular application to which the respective was previously denied access **[Mathew: fig. 17, section of Blocked Web sites, third column; an administrator can select "Allow site"; fig. 16, box 1610 and 1612; par. [0078], lines 1-5 and lines 9-12].**

As per claim 8:

Mathew further teaches the system of claim 6, wherein the report provides a mechanism for the administrator to prohibit the user access to a particular application **[Mathew: fig. 17, section of Visited sites, third column; an administrator can select "Block site"; fig. 16, box 1610 and 1614; par. [0079], lines 1-10].**

As per claim 11:

Beilinson, Kruglenko and Lapidous do not explicitly teach the system wherein the code further causes the processor to report unit updates the report with new collected information after an occurrence of at least one particular computer event.

However, Mathew teaches the system wherein a reporting unit updates the report with new collected information after an occurrence of at least one particular computer event **[Mathew: fig. 5B; fig. 5C; par. [0052]; "the parental control server 204 receives the request resolution and update the consent database 208 with request resolution"].**

Thus, it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the system of Beilinson, Kruglenko and Lapidous by including teaching of Mathew because it would allow administrator control component is operable to track and store the user's allowed and blocked online action, generate a history summary report to administrator **[Mathew, fig. 17, par. [0016]].**

As per claim 20:

Beilinson, Kruglenko and Lapidous do not explicitly teach the system wherein the report provides a mechanism for the administrator to authorize the user access to a particular service to which the respective user was previously denied access.

However, Mathew teaches the system wherein the report provides a mechanism for the administrator to authorize the user access to a particular service to which the respective user was previously denied access **[Mathew: fig. 17, section of Blocked Web sites, third column; an administrator can select "Allow site"; fig. 16, box 1610 and 1612; par. [0078], lines 1-5 and lines 9-12].**

Thus, it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Beilinson, Kruglenko and Lapidous by including the teaching of Mathew because it would allow administrator control component is operable to track and store the user's allowed and blocked online action, generate a history summary report to administrator **[Mathew, fig. 17, par. [0016]].**

As per claim 21:

Beilinson, Kruglenko and Lapidous do not explicitly teach a system wherein the report provides a mechanism for the administrator to prohibit the user access to a particular service to which the respective user was previously granted access.

However, Mathew teaches a system wherein the report provides a mechanism for the administrator to prohibit the respective user access to a particular service to which the respective

user was previously granted access **[Mathew: fig. 17, section of Visited sites, third column; an administrator can select "Block site"; fig. 16, box 1610 and 1614; par. [0079], lines 1-10].**

Thus, it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Beilinson, Kruglenko and Lapidous by including the teaching of Mathew because it would allow administrator control component is operable to track and store the user's allowed and blocked online action, generate a history summary report to administrator **[Mathew, fig. 17, par. [0016]].**

As per claims 27-29, 31-32, 41-42:

Claims 27-29, 32 and 41-42 are similar to those of claims 6-8, 11 and 20-21 accordingly, thus it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claims 6-8, 11 and 20-21 above.

Regard to claim 31, Beilinson, Kruglenko, Lapidous, and Mathew teach subject matter as described in claim 27. Mathew further teaches system wherein the code further causes the processor to store the report of the respective user **[Mathew: par. [0009]; lines 6-8; par. [0069], line 10; a summary information is stored].**

As per claims 48-50, 52-53, 62-63:

Claims 48-50, 53 and 62-63 are essentially the same as claim 6-8, 11 and 20-21 accordingly except that it sets forth the claimed invention as a method rather a system comprising and rejected under the same reasons as applied above.

Regard to claim 52, Beilinson, Kruglenko, Lapidous, and Mathew teach subject matter as described in claim 48. Mathew further teaches storing the report of the user **[par. [0009]; lines 6-8; par. [0069], line 10; a summary information is stored].**

Claims 12-13, 33-34, and 54-55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Beilinson** et al. (US2004/0003279 A1) in view of **Kruglenko** (US 2003/0217287 A1) further in view of **Lapidous** (US 2004/0125149 A1) and further in view of **Mathew** et al. (US 2004/0003071 A1), and further in view of **Rowland** (US 6,405,318 B1).

As per claim 12:

Beilinson, Kruglenko, Lapidous, and Mathew teach the system as described in claim 11.

Beilinson, Kruglenko, Lapidous, and Mathew do not explicitly teach a system wherein the particular computer event includes the user logging on the computer.

However, Rowland teaches a system wherein the particular computer event includes the user logging on the computer **[Rowland: Col. 4, lines 30-38; a system monitors logs (record) all logins and logouts for the target host 21].**

Thus, it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the system of Beilinson, Kruglenko, Lapidous, and Mathew by including the teaching of Rowland because it would be able to detect intrusion as they are occurring or soon after in real-time system **[Rowland, fig. 17, par. [0068], lines 1-3].**

As per claim 13:

Beilinson, Kruglenko, Lapidous, and Mathew teach the system as described in claim 11.

Beilinson, Kruglenko, Lapidous, and Mathew do not explicitly teach a system wherein the particular computer event includes the user logging off the computer.

However, Rowland teaches a system wherein the particular computer event includes the respective user logging off the computer **[Rowland: Col. 4, lines 30-38; a system monitors logs (record) all logins and logouts for the target host 21].**

Thus, it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Beilinson, Kruglenko, Lapidous, and Mathew by including the teaching of Rowland because it would be able to detect intrusion as they are occurring or soon after in real-time system **[Rowland, fig. 17, par. [0068], lines 1-3].**

As per claims 33-34:

Claims 33-34 are similar to those of claims 12-13 accordingly, thus they are rejected with the same rationale applied against claims 12-13 above.

As per claims 54-55:

Claims 54-55 are essentially the same as claim 12-13 accordingly except that it sets forth the claimed invention as a method rather a system comprising and rejected under the same reasons as applied above.

Claims 14, 35, and 56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Beilinson** et al. (US2004/0003279 A1) in view of **Kruglenko** (US 2003/0217287 A1) further in view of

Lapidous (US 2004/0125149 A1) and further in view of **Mathew** et al. (US 2004/0003071 A1), and further in view of **Terry** (US 2002/0026605 A1).

As per claim 14:

Beilinson, Kruglenko, Lapidous, and Mathew teach the system as described in claim 11.

Beilinson, Kruglenko, Lapidous, and Mathew do not explicitly teach a system wherein the particular computer event includes the start up of the computer.

However, Terry teaches a system wherein the particular computer event includes the start up of the computer **[Terry: par. [0051], lines 1-3; " tracking of all internal machine configuration profiles (start-up) in a computer unit 105 having the client application 110"].**

Thus, it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the system of Beilinson, Kruglenko, Lapidous, and Mathew by including the teaching of Terry because it would provide the ability to report in a real-time environment to the monitor station and the ability to record and analyze a "penetration pattern" of unknown program **[Terry, par. [0016] and par. [0017]].**

As per claim 35:

Claim 35 is similar to those of claim 14, thus it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claims 14 above.

As per claim 56:

Claim 56 is essentially the same as claim 14 accordingly except that it sets forth the claimed invention as a method rather a system comprising and rejected under the same reasons as applied above.

Conclusion

The examiner requests, in response to this Office action, support be shown for language added to any original claims on amendment and any new claims. That is, indicate support for newly added claim language by specifically pointing to page(s) and line number(s) in the specification and/or drawing figure(s). This will assist the examiner in prosecuting the application. Failure to show support can result in a non-compliant response.

When responding to this office action, Applicant is advised that if Applicant traverses an obviousness rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103, a reasoned statement must be included explaining why the Applicant believes the Office has erred substantively as to the factual findings or the conclusion of obviousness See 37 CFR 1.111(b).

Additionally Applicant is further advised to clearly point out the patentable novelty which he or she thinks the claims present, in view of the state of the art disclosed by the references cited or the objections made. He or she must also show how the amendments avoid such references or objections See 37 CFR 1.111(c).

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Canh Le whose telephone number is 571-270-1380. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday 7:30AM to 5:00PM other Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Orgad Edan can be reached on 571-272-7884. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Canh Le/

Examiner, Art Unit 2439

June 5, 2009

/Michael J Simitoski/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2439